



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,222	11/12/2003	Yasuo Segawa	492322014800	3536
25227	7590	10/04/2006	EXAMINER	
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD SUITE 300 MCLEAN, VA 22102			NGUYEN, DUNG T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/705,222

Applicant(s)

SEGAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Dung Nguyen

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-7, 21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's response dated 07/12/2006 has been received and entered. Claims 1-7 and 21-22 are now pending in the application.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejections as follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al., US Patent No. 5,805,246, in view of Koike et al, US Patent No. 5,781,253.

Regarding claims 1 and 4, Lee et al disclose a display device (liquid crystal display LCD device)(figures 3A and 3C) comprising:

- . a plurality of pixels (arranged in matrix of 1 and 2);
- . a metal wiring (gate pad 1');
- . a plurality of gate lines (1), wherein each of gate lines comprising a first gate line (left portion of the metal wiring (6)) and a second gate line (right portion of the metal wiring);
- . a gate driving circuit (7);

Lee et al. do not explicitly disclose the metal wiring being disposed over the first gate lines and the second gate lines so as connected the first and second gate lines. Koike et al. do

Art Unit: 2871

disclose a metal wiring (48) for connecting a first gate line (46 on right side of 48) and the second gate line (46 on left side of 48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ the Lee et al. metal wiring as shown by Koike et al. in order to prevent static electricity occurring in an LCD device (col. 3, ln. 32).

Regarding claims 2, 5-7 and 21, Lee et al. disclose the claimed invention as described above except for the based material for gate line, the metal wiring as well as the distance between the first and second gate lines. Kang et al. disclose a metal wiring (e.g. gate pad 115a/157) having a length larger than $10\mu\text{m}$ (col. 6, ln. 33) and made of a material (e.g., 115a made of aluminum, col. 5, ln 2) different from that of a gate line (113 made of chromium) as well as the metal wiring (gate pad 157) over the gate line (113)(see figure 7e). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ a metal wiring (e.g. gate pad) having a length as shown by Kang et al. between the Lee et al. first/second portion gate lines (i.e., a distance therebetween would be larger than $10\mu\text{m}$) as well as the Lee et al. gate line and the metal wiring having a based material as shown by Kang et al. in order to prevent a defect or damage and protect a display quality produced on an LCD (col. 6, ln 65).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claim 3 is allowed.
4. Claim 22 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2871

5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter

The references of record neither disclose nor make obvious a display device comprising a combination of various elements as claimed, more specifically of a distance between an edge of the first gate line/metal wiring and a gate wiring in the output portion of the vertical driving circuit is larger than 10 μ m, the edge of the first gate line facing the gate wiring in the output portion as set forth in claims 3 and 22.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2297. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

Art Unit: 2871

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on 571-272-1782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DN
10/02/2006



Dung Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2871